Demoeritus and Anaxhnaiider were&sraiLfc Atheists as any of them all, though they had the wit to carry themselves externally with more cau1iibi3rs-liess. And indeed it was really one and the selfsame form of Atheism, which both these entertained, they deriving all things alike, from dtetd and stupid matter fortuitously mov6dy the difference between theiB being only this, that fliey tida* rraged it two Different ways;. An&iiaiander in the way of qualities and forms, which is the more viil-%gar and obvious kind of Atheism ;;bnt Bemocritus in* the way of atoms and figures, which seems to be a more learned kind of Atheism.

And though we d[r]o not doubt at all, but that PiatOj in his tenth De Legibiis, wiere he attacks Atheisniy did intend the confutation as well of the I>emocritic as the Anaximandrian Atheism^; y£t whether it were, because he had no mind to take any notice at all of Demoeritus, who is not so much as once mentioned by him any where, or else because he was not so perfectly acquainted with that Atomic way of physiologizing, certain it is, that he there describes' the Atheistic kyp^tbesis more according* to the Anaximandriae* than the Democritic form. For when he represents the Atheistic generation of heaven and earth, and all things in them, as resulting from the fortuitous commixture of hot and[1] cold, hard and soft, moist and. dry corpuscula; this is clearly more agreeable with the Anaxinaandrian generation of theworid,* bjf the secretion of inexistent contrarieties in the matt^B, than the Dernocritic CosmopKEi^, sby tihe fortuitous concourse rif attorns, devoid of all man ner of qualities and forms.

Some indeed seem to call that scheme of Ath0-